

REMARKS

Claims 1-24, 28-30, 33-43, and 81-91 are pending.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a shaving blade unit with a housing defining an aperture, and a clip arranged to retain the one or more shaving blades on the housing. A leg of the clip is received by the aperture and has a bent portion defining a curvature to secure the clip to the housing. The shaving blade unit also includes a trimming blade assembly that is retained on the housing by the clip, the leg of the clip extending through an opening defined by the trimming blade assembly and thereby securing the trimming blade assembly to the housing.

Claim 30 recites a clip having a pair of legs arranged so that each leg extends through one of the apertures to retain the one or more shaving blades on the housing, the clip having legs having differing curvatures, and a trimming blade assembly, a leg of the clip extending through an opening in the trimming assembly to retain the trimming assembly on the housing.

New claim 90 features a shaving blade unit in which the housing defines two pairs of apertures between the front and rear edges, each of the apertures extending from a top surface of the housing, adjacent the cutting edges of the blades, to a bottom, opposite, surface of the housing. The blade unit includes, *inter alia*, a pair of clips, disposed on opposite sides of the cutting region defined by cutting edges of the blades, each clip having a pair of legs, each leg extending through one of the apertures and one leg of each clip extending through the slot, to retain the one or more shaving blades and the trimming blade assembly on the housing.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 28 and 81-84, 86 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious in view of Brown et al. (US 6,185,823) and Rozenkranc (US 6,276,061). Claims 3, 5, 7, 8 and 12 have been rejected as unpatentable in view of these references further in view of Anderson (US 5,761,814). Claims 13, 14, 16-24, 30, 31, 33-43, 85 and 87-89 have been rejected as unpatentable over these references further in view of Parmley.

Applicants will address these rejections as they apply to independent claims 1 and 30. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Brown et al. discloses various blade units and blade unit housings or "frames" The blade unit housings shown in Figures 1-9 and 17 include a large rectangular aperture 2, the function of which is to hold the blades and any associated components (not shown in these figures). Of these figures, the only figure that shows details of the housing structure is Figure 17.

Figures 14-16 show completed blade units, with blades 15 held in place by a clip 16. These are the only figures that show the completed blade unit, and thus the only figures that show a clip. Aperture 2 is not numbered in these views. However, the blade units include a similar central opening (not numbered) that accommodates the blades. The housing used in these figures differs from that shown in Fig. 17, in that the central opening or aperture is defined between two V-shaped structures of the housing (also not numbered). The clip 16 does not extend into or through the central opening defined by the housing, or into any type of aperture. Instead, the legs of each clip extend into the V-shaped structures, which are closed at the bottom according to the shading in the cutting plane.

Brown does not explain how the clip is attached in the V-shaped structure. There is nothing to suggest that the V-shaped structure includes an aperture through which the clip extends, or that the clip includes a bent portion, as required by claim 1.

Applicants disagree with the Examiners interpretation of Brown et al. on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, i.e., that a leg of the clip is "received by the aperture" and that "a leg of the clip extends through an opening defined by the trimming blade assembly." There is no indication in Brown that the closed V-shaped structure of the frame includes an aperture, and the clip clearly does not extend into the central opening in which the blades are positioned.

Thus, Brown neither teaches nor suggests a number of features of Applicants' claims, including a clip extending through an aperture in the housing, a trimming blade assembly including a slot, a clip extending through a slot in a trimming blade assembly, and a clip having a bent portion or defining a curvature.

Rozenkranc fails to supply the teachings that are lacking in Brown. Rozenkranc discloses shaving blades and a trim blade, but is entirely silent regarding how the blades are mounted. Rozenkranc does not disclose that the trim blade is part of a trimming blade assembly that defines a slot which is used for retaining the assembly to the body. Nor does Rozenkranc disclose a clip extending through an aperture in the housing to secure the blades and a trim blade to the housing, much less a clip having a bent portion or defining a curvature.

Because Brown uses clip 16 to hold the blades 15, the examiner alleges that it would be obvious to add the trim blade of Rozenkranc to the blade unit of Brown et al. and to use the same clip 16 to mount the trim blade. The Examiner contends that the required changes would be obvious as it would only be necessary "to extend the clip length."

We respectfully disagree with these allegations. As disclosed in Rozenkranc, the trim blade and the shaving blades are positioned at different locations of the shaving apparatus. If the artisan had considered it obvious to add the trimming blade of Rozenkranc to the shaving unit of Brown et al., to mount the trim blade in the location of Rozenkranc would require using a separate clip positioned to secure the trim blade. Thus, the leg of clip 16 could not be used to secure the trim blade of Rozenkranc simply by extending its length, as contended.

Even if the artisan had modified both Brown and Rozenkranc, so as to position Rozenkranc's trim blade directly below Brown's blades, extending the length of the clip would still not secure the trim blade. Since there is no suggestion in Brown that the clip extends through the apparently closed V-shaped structure, extending the length of the clip 16, if even possible, would not result in clip 16 securing the trim blade to the housing.

Thus, even if Brown and Rozenkranc could be properly combined, which is not conceded, the combined teachings of Rozenkranc and Brown et al. would not result in the subject matter as claimed.

Neither Parnley nor Anderson remedy the deficiencies of Brown and Rozenkranc, discussed above.

Parnley discloses various metal inserts and fasteners for plastic parts (*see* pages 20-24/25). Parnley does not disclose, nor is Parnley cited for a disclosure of, an attachment system

in which a leg of a clip extends through an aperture or opening, nor using such a system to mount blades on a shaving blade unit.

Anderson et al. disclose a clip 50 that partly surrounds a body member 2 of a razor construction. Clip 50 does not include a leg extending through an aperture or opening, nor is Anderson cited to provide such a teaching.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants have not addressed each and every position taken by the Examiner, for example statements made regarding the secondary references that are presently moot; this does not indicate that the Applicants concede these points. Applicants reserve the right to address such issues during further prosecution.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please charge any other charges or credits, to deposit account 06 1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-656001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

/Celia H. Leber/  
Celia H. Leber  
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906